



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

CH

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,421	07/10/2001	Venkateswarlu Kolluri	10984-540001 / P258	7671
26161	7590	05/16/2006		EXAMINER
FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			BHATIA, AJAY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2145	

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/902,421	KOLLURI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ajay M. Bhatia	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-9 and 11-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-2, 4-9, 11-21, and 22-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/27/06
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

Applicant fails to particularly and distinctly define the location the specification where new amendments are supported.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicant has failed to specify where newly presented claim limitations are supported in the specification, therefore is new matter. Additionally applicant amendments seem to break current interpretation of the first link and second link, in relation to the inferred relation, therefore applicant is required to point out where support can be found for the inferred relation between the first link and second link with the new limitation.

Art Unit: 2145

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: see above for clarification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-21, and 22-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinbergn (U.S. Patent 6,112,202) in view of Associative Information Access Using DualNAVI referred to as DualNAVI.

For claim 1, Kleinberg teaches, an inferred relation weighting process for determining the strength of an inferred relation between a first Internet object and a second Internet object, where the first and second Internet objects are not directly linked, comprising:

a first link weighting process for determining a first strength of a first link between the first Internet object and a common object; (Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2 line 58 to

Art Unit: 2145

Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28)

a second link weighting process for determining a second strength of a second link between the second Internet object and the common object; (Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2 line 58 to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28)

and an inferred relation weight calculation process for calculating the strength of the inferred relation based on the first strength and the second strength;. (Kleinberg, Col. 6 lines 55-64, Col. 9 lines 37-43, Col. 10 lines 6-Col. 4 lines 53-65, Col. 10 lines 41-46, Col. 10 lines 65-67, Col. Col. 4 lines 34-43 lines Col. 4 lines 53-65-Col. 6 lines 21-29)

Kleinberg fails to disclose fully, wherein the Internet object comprises a query for retrieving a document and the second Internet object comprises a document.

Kleinberg with DualNAVI teaches, wherein the Internet object comprises a query for retrieving a document and the second Internet object comprises a document.
(DualNAVI, 2.1-3.3) and (Kleinberg, Col. 4 lines 43-65, Col. 8 line 43 to Col. 9 line 29)

Kleinberg and DualNAVI are both in the field of document querying.

DualNAVI is compatible with Kleinberg because DualNAVI supports dual query types,
2.1

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to interchange Kleinberg method of querying object with the second query in DualNAVI's method of using two queries. Because the using dual queries provides for more relevant results. (DualNAVI, 3.2)

For claim 2, Kleinberg-DualNAVI teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 1, wherein the common object comprises a plurality of Internet objects, the plurality of Internet objects being interconnected via discrete link, the plurality of Internet objects being connected to the first and second links; and wherein the inferred relation weighting process further comprises an intermediate link weighting process for determining a strength of each discrete link, wherein the strength of the inferred relation is based also on a strength of each discrete link. (Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2 line 58 to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 6 lines 55-64, Col. 9 lines 37-43, Col. 10 lines 6-Col. 4 lines 53-65, Col. 10 lines 41-46, Col. 10 lines 65-67, Col. Col. 4 lines 34-43 lines Col. 4 lines 53-65-Col. 6 lines 21-29)

For claim 4, Kleinberg-DualNAVI teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 1, wherein the common object comprises at least one Internet document.
(Kleinberg, Col. 5 lines 60-63, Col. 6 lines 10-20, Col. 6 lines 21-29)

For claim 5, Kleinberg-DualNAVI teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 2, further comprising: a link limitation process for specifying a link limit concerning a maximum number of links used to determine the inferred relation. (Kleinberg, Col. 8 lines 25-27)

For claim 6, Kleinberg-DualNAVI teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 2 further comprising an incoming link analysis process for determining a number of objects linked to each Internet object, wherein an incoming link value of a target Internet object is proportional to a number of objects linked to the target Internet object.
(Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 lines 53-65, Col. 6 lines 10-20, Col. 6 lines 21-29)

For claim 7, Kleinberg-DualNAVI teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 2 further comprising an outgoing link analysis process for determining a number of objects that each Internet object is linked to, wherein an outgoing link value of a target Internet object is proportional to a number of objects to which the target Internet object is linked. (Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 7 lines 16-20)

For claim 8, Kleinberg-DualNAVI teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 2, wherein the inferred relation weight calculation process comprises a relation recalculation process for redefining values corresponding to strengths of discrete links and to the first and second strengths in response to calculation of the strength of the inferred relation. (Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 lines 53-65, 24, Col. 10 lines 41-46, Col. 10 lines 65-67, Col. 10 lines 6-Col. 4 lines 53-65)

For claim 9, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 1, wherein at least one of the Internet objects. (Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2 line 58 to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28)

Kleinberg fail to clearly disclose, Internet objects comprises a transaction record.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the method of searching using link object and the search of ecommerce data in order because it is well known in the art to search for items based on a price or linked to other items. (Kleinberg, Col. 5 lines 20-25)

For claim 11, Kleinberg-DualNAVI teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 1, wherein at least one of the Internet objects comprises an Internet document.
(Kleinberg, Col. 7 lines 33-38)

For claim 12, Kleinberg-DualNAVI teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 1, wherein the strength of the inferred relation corresponds to a relevance score.
(Kleinberg, Col. 4 lines 53-65)

For claim 13, Kleinberg-DualNAVI teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 9, wherein the relevance score. (Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2 line 58 to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28)

Kleinberg fail to clearly disclose, relevance score comprises a percentage

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to represent the mathematical value of Kleinberg in the form of a percentage in order to represent the score in a manner familiar to the user. Official notice it taken.

Claims 14-36 list all the same elements of claims 1-13. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claims 1-13 applies equally as well to claims 14-36.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached Notice of references cited (if appropriate).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ajay M. Bhatia whose telephone number is (571)-272-3906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571)272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jason Cardone
Supervisor Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2145

AB